

### REMARKS

Amendments to claims 2, 6, and 12 are to correct typographical errors. Amendments to claims 1, 7, 9, 13, 21, 23, 31, and 38 are for the purpose of clarifying what Applicants regard as the inventions. Amendments to claims 28, 29, 35, 36, 42, and 43 are to bring these claims into conformity with the language of their respective base claim(s). No new matter has been added.

#### I. Claim rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-44 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,058,389 (Chandra). Applicants respectfully note that in order to sustain a rejection under § 102, each of the claimed elements must be found, either expressly or inherently, in the cited reference.

#### Claims 1 and 45

Claim 1 recites a history table comprising a history record for a consumer for an information record, said history record comprising *a message state field for indicating whether said data of said information record have been provided to said consumer*. Chandra does not disclose or suggest such a history table. According to the Office Action, column 12, lines 10-16, and column 31, lines 50-55 of Chandra discloses updating a history table. However, the cited passages disclose:

A message can be dequeued by more than one application. Each queue acts as a message repository, and each application has a different view of the same queue. Accordingly, a message can be dequeued and deleted from an application's view, while the same message remains in the queue view of another application.

In operation, when the CREATE.sub.-- QTABLE process is invoked for a named queue table, the process checks whether the queue table exists in the Queue Table Dictionary Table. If the queue table does not exist in the dictionary table, the process also checks whether the named queue table exists in the system anyway. If not, a new queue table is created. In either case, the dictionary table is updated to reflect the new queue table or the existing queue table found in the system.

As such, the cited passages does not disclose a history table, even less, the history table as recited in claim 1. For at least the foregoing reason, claim 1 and its dependent claims are believed allowable over Chandra.

Claim 1 also recites updating the history table by setting said message state field in a history record corresponding to said consumer to indicate said consumer accessed said data. Chandra also does not disclose or suggest such limitation. According to the Office Action, column 19, lines 25-27 of Chandra discloses the above limitation. However, the cited passage discloses:

In step 758, the process then updates the state of the current message to PROCESSED. As such, the cited passage dose not disclose setting *a message state field in a history record*, as recited in claim 1. For this additional reason, claim 1 and its dependent claims are believed allowable over Chandra.

New claim 45 recites the same limitations as claim 1. As such, claim 45 and its dependent claims are believed allowable over Chandra for at least the same reasons that claim 1 is allowable.

#### Claim 13

Claim 13 recites a table comprising one or more table records, said table record comprising an identification of information in an information queue record, said table record further comprising a consumer identification field comprising an identification of a consumer, and a message state field for indicating whether an information queue record has been accessed by the consumer. As discussed with the Examiner, Chandra does not disclose or suggest such table. For at least the foregoing reason, claim 13 and its dependent claims are believed allowable over Chandra.

Claim 13 also recites an information queue, and a table *separated from said information queue*, said table comprising one or more table records. As the Examiner correctly noted in the

March 31, 2003 Office Action, Chandra does not disclose or suggest such a table. According to the current Office Action, Chandra discloses an information queue (queue table 200), and column 7, lines 6-12 and 40 discloses a table separated from the queue table 200. However, the cited passages actually disclose:

Some of the columns in a queue table 200 are meta-data describing a queue 202, 204. In one embodiment, each row of the queue table 200 has the following columns: . . .  
DEQ\_USER\_ID.

As such the table information DEQ\_USER\_ID is a part of the queue table 200, and is not *separated* from the queue table 200. For at least the foregoing reasons, claim 13 and its dependent claims are believed allowable over Chandra.

Claim 21

Claim 21 recites a history table separated from said message queue comprising one or more history records, each of said one or more history records comprising a message identification, a consumer identification and a message state identification, each said message state identification indicating whether one of the one or more message queue records has been accessed. Chandra does not disclose or suggest such history table. According to the Office Action, the queue table 200 of Chandra is a history table. However, as shown in figure 2 of Chandra, the queue table 200 actually contains multiple queue messages. As such, the queue table 200 of Chandra is not a history table, even less, a history table having a history record that comprises a message identification, a consumer identification and a message state identification, as recited in claim 21. For at least the foregoing reason, claim 21 and its dependent claims are believed allowable over Chandra.

Claim 23, 31, and 38

Claims 23, 31, and 38 each recites indicating in a third location in a history table that said second consumer has accessed said first piece of information, said history table having a second message state field for indicating whether said second consumer has accessed said first piece of information. Chandra does not disclose or suggest such limitation. According to the Office Action, column 31, lines 48-53 discloses the above limitation. However, the cited passage actually discloses:

In operation, when the CREATE\_QTABLE process is invoked for a named queue table, the process checks whether the queue table exists in the Queue Table Dictionary Table. If the queue table does not exist in the dictionary table, the process also checks whether the named queue table exists in the system anyway.

As such, Chandra teaches checking whether a named queue table exists, and does not disclose or suggest indicating in a third location that a second consumer has accessed information. For at least the foregoing reason, claims 23, 31, and 38, and their respective dependent claims, are believed allowable over Chandra.

**CONCLUSION**

Based on the foregoing, all remaining claims are believed allowable and a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any questions or comments regarding this amendment, please contact the undersigned at the number listed below.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any fees due in connection with the filing of this document to Bingham McCutchen's Deposit Account No. 50-2518, referencing billing number 7011472001. The Commissioner is authorized to credit any overpayment or to charge any underpayment to Bingham McCutchen's Deposit Account No. 50-2518, referencing billing number 7011472001.

Respectfully submitted,

Bingham McCutchen LLP

Dated: \_\_\_\_\_

12/21/04

By: \_\_\_\_\_

Peter C. Mei

Reg. No. 39,768

Bingham McCutchen LLP  
Three Embarcadero Center  
San Francisco, California 94111  
Telephone: (650) 849-4870  
Facsimile: (650) 849-4800